R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 186 TE 000 119

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAMS FOR THE SEVENTIES.

BY- HOOK, J.N.
MINNESOTA COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

PUB DATE JAN 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.68 15P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, *ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, *PREDICTION, *TEACHING METHODS, PROGRAMED INSTRUCTION, DIALECTS, GRAMMAR, AUDIOLINGUAL METHODS, LEXICOLOGY, TEAM TEACHING, NONGRADED SYSTEM, AUDIOVISUAL AIDS, COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION, LANGUAGE USAGE, RHETORIC, DIACHRONIC LINGUISTICS, ENGLISH,

IT IS NOW THE YEAR 1976, AND CHANGE IN OUR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING HAS BEEN AFFECTED BY A MODERN AMERICAN REVOLUTION. AS ENGLISH BECOMES MORE UNIVERSAL, SO DOES THE ORAL-AURAL METHOD OF TEACHING IT. IN UNITED STATES CLASSROOMS, CHILDREN PRACTICE ORALLY THOSE PATTERNS THEY NEED, EXPERIMENT WITH WORD ORDER, AND GAIN A KNOWLEDGE OF SENTENCE STRUCTURE. USAGE IS APPROACHED LARGELY THROUGH ORAL PRACTICE, WITH ATTENTION GIVEN TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF DIALECTS WHICH DIFFER ACCORDING TO THE GEOGRAPHY, TIME, PRESTIGE, AND ETIQUETTE OF THE SITUATION. THE STUDY OF GRAMMAR IS A BLEND OF TRADITIONAL, STRUCTURAL, AND TRANSFORMATIONAL. THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LEXICOLOGY (ALL FACETS OF THE STUDY OF WORDS) ARE IMPORTANT PARTS OF LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION. RHETORIC TEACHING EMPHASIZES THE COMBINATION OF INDEPENDENT ELEMENTS, SUBORDINATION, COMPACTNESS OF EXPRESSION, AND THE IMPORTANCE OF MODIFIERS. CLASSROOM METHODS STRESS ATTENTION TO THE INDIVIDUAL AND WIDE BUT SELECTIVE USE OF PROGRAMED MATERIALS. THE MEDIA SPECIALIST HELPS THE TEACHER MAKE EFFECTIVE USE OF A WIDE VARIETY OF AUDIO-VISUAL AND REFERENCE AIDS. OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATIONS ARE COMPUTER-CONTROLLED LEARNING ROOMS, TEAM-TEACHING, AND THE NON-GRADED PLAN. CONSEQUENTLY, THIS AFFIRMATIVE PROGRAM, ENGAGING STUDENTS IN CONSTRUCTIVE TASKS, HELPS US TO USE ENGLISH MORE EFFECTIVELY AND INCREASES WORLD UNDERSTANDING. THIS ARTICLE APPEARED IN "MINNESOTA ENGLISH," VOL. 3, NO. 1, JANUARY 1967. (MM)

ED015186

minnesota english

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAMS FOR THE SEVENTIES . . . 1
J. N. Hook

LET'S TEACH COMPOSITION--IMPRACTICALLY 15
Gene L. Piché

LINGUISTICS AND THE TEACHING OF READING. 26
Mildred A. Carlson

ENGLISH AND READING INSTITUTES FOR 1967. 31

Volume III, No. 1
January, 1967

TE 000 119

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY J. N. Hook
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

MCTE
minnesota council of teachers of english

LANGUAGE PROGRAMS FOR THE SEVENTIES

J. N. Hook

(For both elementary and secondary teachers, this article looks at current developments in school language study by way of an imaginary journey to the future. Dr. Hook, professor of English at the University of Illinois, was keynote speaker at the MCTE Fall Regional Workshop at Mankato.)

Come with me, please, into the year 1976, the two hundredth anniversary of the American Revolution. We shall talk about classrooms with programs designed to effect another kind of revolution, a revolution in the teaching of the English language--the language of George Washington, of Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Whitman, of Lincoln and Churchill and Kennedy, the first or second language of almost a billion of the earth's inhabitants in 1976.

In the 1950's and 1960's it became increasingly apparent to Earthlings that for mutual ease of communication it was highly desirable for most or all to share a common tongue. Once Latin had served this purpose for the well-educated of the so-called civilized world, meaning, in the semantics of that time, in main the countries of Western Europe. A scholar could travel in England, Germany, France, Italy, Greece, parts of Middle Europe, and Scandinavia, and be understood by fellow-scholars in all those countries because he and they both knew Latin. He could not, however, speak with the peasants or the other unschooled ones. Some internationally minded business men also used Latin as a medium for conducting their affairs.

Gradually, though, the use of Latin declined. In the days of Spanish power and then of French power, pockets of Spanish and French speakers came into existence almost around the globe. And then explorers from some islands just west of the European mainland began probing the far corners of the earth. Many of them settled abroad--in North America, in parts of South America, in Africa, in parts of Asia, in Australia. Their language, English, became the official tongue in some of these lands. And people in other lands found it useful for them to learn it, too. By the early 1960's perhaps as many as a third of

TEOCO 119

the world's inhabitants had at least a smattering of English. In Scandinavian countries, every child studied it, because English was the language of trade, and Scandinavia was dependent on trade. In Russia it was more widely studied than any other foreign language. Japan had eighty thousand teachers of English, four-fifths as many as taught it in the secondary schools of the United States. In India, even after independence, English was a standard school subject. In Peru and Colombia public address systems broadcast English lessons to people sitting on benches in the town square. English lessons appeared in hundreds of daily papers around the world. English was one of the official languages of the United Nations. And in 1966, William Benton, United States ambassador to UNESCO, recommended that English be designated the semi-official second language of the world, despite the outraged protests of Charles DeGaulle of France, who believed that French should be chosen.

Through the early 1960's the United States government had become increasingly aware that language could be a force for international understanding and had begun expending money on teaching English abroad. It set up libraries in foreign countries; some of them were pillaged and burned, but others remained. It sent teachers abroad to teach other teachers some of the best ways to give instruction in English; they went to Africa, to Asia, to South America, to the islands of the Pacific. Its soldiers picked up a few words of the languages of the countries in which they were stationed, and the natives of the countries learned still more English. The Center for Applied Linguistics encouraged scholarly research in the learning and teaching of English while it helped Americans to learn how to learn foreign languages. The United States Information Agency sponsored series of English textbooks for study abroad, and provided leadership so that emerging nations of Africa or developing nations of Asia and South America could master this tool of international communication and trade. Even Russia helped in the teaching of English; she prepared her own English textbooks for use abroad, with their built-in lessons in opposition to "American imperialism."

By 1976 the work of some fifteen years has begun to show results. An American or British traveler can go al-

most anywhere in the world and be confident that he can order a meal or talk about the weather and be understood. Only in the remote fastnesses of China or central Africa might he find no one with whom to converse.

The method used in teaching English to the hundreds of millions in foreign countries emphasizes the oral language. This is the natural way to learn a language. The infant obviously does not learn his native language by studying its grammar and reading it. His mother does not say to him, "A noun is the name of a person, place, or thing." Instead, she says, "Ball. See the ball. Do you want the ball? This is a ball. I'll roll the ball to you. Roll the ball to me." After a while, the infant says, "Baw," and he's on his way. Soon he, too, through imitation first of words and then of the sentence patterns he hears--soon he will be saying, "Roll the ball." Later, as he grows older, his sentences will become more complex. By the time he reaches school age, he will be using most of the sentence forms that adults use, yet he has not encountered a grammatical term and probably has not read more than a few words.

English Teaching in the U.S.A.

The teaching of English in foreign countries has influenced the teaching of English in the United States in 1976. Language is basically a spoken thing. Even the word language goes back to the Latin word for tongue, not to the Latin word for pen. But during most of our educational history, after the first or second grade, we ceased emphasizing the spoken language and stressed the written and printed forms. Study of grammar, the description of the language, is abstract, Dora V. Smith has pointed out that the technical study of grammar is as abstruse a subject as the calculus in mathematics. But in years gone by, even elementary school youngsters have had to parse and diagram sentences.

Now, though, in 1976, the emphasis has changed. In the grades, children practice orally the patterns that are least familiar or most difficult for them. They play with sentences, seeing which parts fit together, which are movable, which incapable of being shifted from one place to another. They supplement oral practice, in the lower

grades, by "rolling readers," developed in part by Priscilla Tyler. These are small cubes, with a single word printed on each face. The child rolls the cubes in a certain order, and a sentence results. He reads the sentence, rolls again, and a different sentence comes up. But he finds that if he changes the order in which he rolls the cubes, there is no sentence--just nonsense. The seven-year-old thus learns a basic fact about the English language: word order is important. It is the guiding principle of the whole language. In earlier instruction, often based on the teaching of Latin, word order was not stressed. For that reason, a number of problems in sentence structure remained with children for the rest of their lives. Dangling modifiers, squinting modifiers, and countless other kinds of incoherence result from lack of a clear understanding of the principles of word order.

Teaching Usage in 1976

Matters of usage, in 1976, are also approached largely through oral practice. The child whose parents say "Me and him was walkin' along," the experience of many years has shown us, is not likely to be converted to "He and I were walking along" by grammatical analysis of the pronouns and the verb. But when through games and oral repetition the child has heard many times "He and I were walking along" that sentence comes to seem natural to him; he begins using it and other sentences like it in school; eventually it becomes part of his language. At home he may still conform to the usage of his parents, because conformity is important to him; he feels the need to belong in his environment, and language conformity is essential to belonging.

This brings us to another facet of the English language teaching of the 1970's. In earlier times, when a child said "ain't" or "Me and him was walkin' along," his teacher told him that his language was wrong. "There's no such word as ain't," many teachers said. The child, in his infinite wisdom, knew better; of course there was such a word as ain't; he heard it every day; he could even find it in the dictionary. And why should the teacher say that it was wrong to say "Me and him was walkin' along"? His parents said things like that. His friends said it. Why

should the teacher say that his parents were wrong? What made the teacher's language always right and his own language and that of his world wrong?

The schools of the 1970's, in contrast, do not make much use of the words right and wrong. The teachers do talk a lot about dialects. They say that everyone speaks a dialect or several dialects. In fact, every person speaks at least a little differently from every other person. He has his own personal dialect, or idiolect. Dialects vary according to regions of a country. They vary also in smaller regions. Chicago has its own speech peculiarities; so has Philadelphia, or New York, or Minneapolis. Rural Minnesota has some speech oddities infrequently heard in the Twin Cities. In England, when one travels from one shire to another, he notices considerable change in dialect. In Yorkshire, different parts of the shire have very different speech habits. Dialects vary also with time. Middle English differs in many ways from Modern English; the double negative, now largely frowned upon in formal English, was a perfectly acceptable construction in Chaucer's day. Old English is almost as different from Modern English as if it were a foreign language. Even eighteenth-century English varied in many ways from Modern English. In pronunciation, for instance, one usually heard tay for tea, jine for join, Lunnon for London, goold for gold. In syntax, the eighteenth century seldom used the passive voice; one did not say, "The house in being built." Instead, it was "The house is building."

Some Other Differences

So students are shown that dialects differ according to geography and according to time. They differ also in other ways. We shift dialects depending upon where we are and whom we are talking with. The language we use at a ball game is not the same as that we use on a more formal occasion. And we use somewhat different language in talking to a child than we use in talking to a grandmother, a still different one in talking to grandfather, and others when we are talking with a lawyer or a bank president or a possible employer.

Dialects vary also in prestige, we teach our children. In the courts of kings in centuries gone by, the language

of the king and courtiers was the most prestigious. It is said that the lisped Spanish c, as in Barcelona (Barthelona), is due to a speech defect of a Spanish king; his courtiers wanted to talk as the king did, and other people imitated the courtiers, so many Spaniards even today say Barthelona.. In the United States, too, some dialect forms are more prestigious than others. Ain't isn't wrong, but it happens that in the twentieth century it is frowned upon by most users of the prestige dialect. "Me and him was walkin' along" happens now not to be prestigious, though it is perfectly clear. The etiquette of the prestige dialect demands that as a rule we refer to the other person before we refer to ourselves; it also says that him and me are used in some parts of a sentence but not in other parts. And it says that in some circumstances we use one form of be (was), in other circumstances we use another form (were).

The prestige dialect is no more "right" than any other, but there are many times when we should be able to use it. We let our students realize that this dialect will be demanded if they go to college, that many employers insist upon it, that front doors open to its users, and that users of nonprestigious dialects may have to go to the back of the house. We do not try to eradicate the children's non-prestigious dialect forms, we do not say that their parents who use those forms are in the wrong, but we do try to make it possible for them to know the prestigious ones, to practice using them, and hopefully to switch as easily to these forms as they switch dialects when they go to a ball game or talk with someone not their own age.

Grammar in 1976

Teachers in the 1970's teach grammar, too. The developments here have been very interesting. For years teachers taught what has come to be called traditional grammar. This was essentially a grammar based upon Latin, despite the fact that English is a Teutonic language, not a Romance language. It had strengths and weaknesses. Its strength was that it was a relatively complete system, developed over many years, and capable of describing after a fashion almost any sentence in the language. Its weaknesses were that its classifications were sometimes faul-

ty, as when schoolbooks placed words like very and words like suddenly into the same category, adverbs, even though these words are used in quite unlike ways; second, its definitions were often inadequate, for example "A sentence is a group of words expressing a complete thought" (a sentence is not necessarily a group of words, and nobody knows what a complete thought is); third, it pays no attention to the basically spoken nature of language; and fourth, it fails to recognize the kernel sentences from which all others are formed.

The structuralist grammarians, in contrast, emphasized the oral language. They discovered elaborate principles of phonology, including the suprasegmentals of stress, pitch, and juncture that contribute so much to our making ourselves understood when we speak. They consistently stressed form rather than meaning; whereas the traditionalists defined a noun, for example, in terms of its meaning, the structuralists defined it in terms of the form changes and the structures, the environments, that are characteristic of the noun. They paid much less attention to syntax than to morphology. This, together with their lack of emphasis on meaning, was their greatest weakness.

The generative or transformational grammarian, in contrast, emphasized syntax. He found that basically the English sentence is a simple statement, a kernel. Through a number of changes that can be precisely described (called transformations), negative structures, questions, and other variations are possible; they all are built upon a relatively small number of kernels. The transformationalists have described sentence structure in such precise mathematical terms that now, in the 1970's, they have made machine translation not only possible but also readable and idiomatic, and they have programmed computers that can "write" complex explanations at unbelievable speeds or even compose formula stories and write poetry. Unfortunately for teaching purposes, transformational grammar has become so complex by 1976 that only graduate mathematicians and linguistic specialists can understand it, and none of them all of it.

So the schools have had to form their own grammar, and the task is still going on. Our school grammar of 1976 is a blend of traditional, structural, and transformational. Traditional has supplied much of the terminology; struc-

tural has presented the oral elements, especially pitch, stress, and juncture, and has clarified morphology; transformational has provided most of the syntax.

Some false conceptions about the reasons for teaching grammar have been eliminated in 1976. Teachers used to believe that if students could cerebrally comprehend grammar, they would inevitably write and speak "better." Despite many studies that revealed that grammatical understanding was no guarantee of "good" usage, teachers kept on doggedly, sure in their own minds that the researchers must be wrong. We now regard grammar as basically a cultural study. Language is one of man's greatest possessions, and any person who claims to be educated should know how it works. Beyond that, some still believe, grammatical knowledge may help some students to become at home with some of the less usual sentence forms, and to improve their own writing on the more sophisticated levels. Also, a detailed knowledge of grammar contributes to ease in reading poetry or other difficult literature.

So in 1976 we still teach grammar, but not for exactly the same reasons that we once did.

Rhetoric in 1976

The boundaries between grammar and rhetoric have meanwhile become somewhat blurred, thanks to the research of such men as Kellogg Hunt and Francis Christensen. Hunt, in 1962 to 1964, examined sentences written by fourth graders, eighth graders, twelfth graders, and professional writers. Differences in the sentences written by these various groups were not mainly in length. Fourth-graders, who tend to string ideas together with and or so, write sentences about as long as those of older students and professional writers. The difference lies in the degree of compactness of sentences. A twelfth-grader or a professional writer crams more ideas, more information, into a sentence of twenty words than does the fourth—grader. He has mastered such subordinating devices as the phrase or the dependent clause or the appositive; he often reduces a whole sentence to a phrase or even a single word. The fourth-grader writes, "I saw a dog, and it was big and brown." The twelfth-grader or often even the eighth-grader writes, "I saw a big, brown dog." As a result of the

work of Hunt and others, in our teaching we now place much more emphasis on combination of independent elements, on subordination, on compactness of expression. Our students therefore often write sentences that are rhetorically more effective than those most students wrote in the sixties.

Francis Christensen in the sixties pointed out that in our stress upon the basic parts of a sentence--subject, verb, and complement--we often overlooked or minimized the importance of modifiers. These modifiers, he demonstrated, are often what give a sentence its life. They determine the tone, the style, often the meaning. He illustrated by taking a passage from a professional writer like Walter Van Tilburg Clark, stripping it to its essentials, eliminating the subordinate elements and most of the descriptive terms. The style became dull, choppy, lifeless. The reinsertion of the modifiers brought it back to life. Many, perhaps most, of our students used to write stripped-down sentences. Teachers now, in the seventies, try to help them to see the details that should be added and to insert those details in rhetorically effective sentences.

Some Changes in Methods

Classroom methods have also changed greatly in the past decade or so. Though the closed-in classroom, one teacher facing thirty or so students at the same hour day after day, is still with us, it is by no means the universal that it once was. The emphasis has been increasingly placed upon giving each student what he needs most at a particular time. In the old days, if five students in a class of thirty did not understand the use of the semicolon, we gave instruction in the semicolon to everybody, even though five-sixths of our students were wasting their time. Today, upon identifying the five students who need work on the semicolon, we place before them a piece of programed material that in a few minutes teaches them the semicolon inductively and gives them practice in its use. Meanwhile the other twenty-five are working on other programed materials, either more or less sophisticated, that they as individuals need. Programing does not work well with everything; in literature, for example, it is useful mainly in teaching certain concepts such as plot devices,

or the identification of certain literary items such as meter or metaphor. A program often gets in the way of appreciation, and hence has limited use in the teaching of literature. But it can be used extensively in the teaching of some facets of language. Grammar can be programed. Usage can be improved through programing, especially when the program is supplemented by oral work. Punctuation can be taught by programing, and the programing can be reinforced by oral work stressing juncture. Spelling, though still a problem, can be programed, and instruction via programed spelling is much more individual than in the conventional method of handing everybody the same list on Monday and giving a test on Friday. Vocabulary can also be strengthened through programing. One eighth grade in Manhasset, New York, for instance, through a program came to be quickly at home with many useful but fairly difficult words such as composure or juxtaposed.

A Variety of Equipment

Besides programing, schools are using other relatively new devices. Thanks to federal help, most classrooms are much better equipped in the 1970's than they used to be. Record players, tape recorders, television sets, film and film-strip projectors, and opaque and overhead projectors are standard equipment in most schools. Almost every English classroom has a room library, with many of the books changed frequently; the room has a dictionary for every child and single copies of other useful reference books. The biggest problem that some teachers face is choosing from the wealth of films, slides, transparencies, programed instructional materials, books, and other materials that have become available. As a result, many school systems now employ media specialists whose principal function is to screen possibly useful material and tentatively recommend certain items for the more careful consideration of the teachers in the various departments.

Some of the more advanced schools in 1976 have installed computer-controlled learning rooms. A learning room is a small cubicle, just large enough for one student and equipped with earphones, a small TV-like screen, and a microfilm reader. The student enters the room and dials the call number of material he or his teacher be-

lieves he should use. What happens next depends upon the nature of the material. The computer center electronically takes the necessary steps. If a film is to be viewed, it appears on the screen. If the material is a lecture or lecturette, the sound comes through the earphones. If it is programed instruction, the screen may once more be used, or else the microfilm reader. If it is a book, the pages appear on either the screen or the reader, and the student "turns the pages" by pressing a button.

Team teaching is also used in many of our schools. The experiments of the sixties, though not uniformly successful, did show that some material may be effectively presented in large groups, that some things necessitate small group discussion and practice, and that some may be most effectively studied by individuals. Today we know more about what fits best into each type of instruction. Team teaching is not more economical than other instruction, but it does have the value that it can take advantage of special faculty strengths. Thus a teacher who is especially well grounded in the English language may play a leading role there, perhaps conducting the large-group sessions and planning the discussion groups and individual work in language. Other experts take the lead in other parts of the total English program.

As I said before, the stress in 1976 is on helping each individual student where he most needs help. Wide adoption of non-graded school plans has helped to facilitate this development. We have long known, for example, that thirty twelve-year-olds will have almost thirty different degrees of readiness for various parts of our instruction. Yet in the past all students had to move in the same lockstep fashion through every grade. In the non-graded school, though the system provides tremendous problems in scheduling, a student's age or his year in school does not determine what he studies, Instead, the stage he has reached in his own educational development is the major determinant. He is placed with other students who have reached about the same level, regardless of their chronological age, and, as I have said, a considerable share of his time is spent in individual work.

Two of the most important parts of the language program in 1976 I have not yet mentioned. One of these is the history of the language; the other is lexicology.

The English language has a fascinating history, and its relationships with other of the world's languages are also interesting. In the elementary schools in the seventies, when children are studying about other countries, something is usually said about the languages of those countries. If they are related to English, the relationships are pointed out. Thus the other Teutonic languages--particularly German and the Scandinavian languages--may be called sister languages. The Romance languages--Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Rumanian--are among the cousins of English. More distant cousins include Greek, Russian and other Slavic languages, Iranian, and even some of the languages of India. Older children may draw trees of language to illustrate how all the branches I have named, and still more, have grown from a single root and trunk. And since English has borrowed heavily from many languages--not just the Latin and Greek and French of which we are likely to think--students in junior or senior high school may study some of those borrowings and perhaps draw a river to represent the English language, with tributaries of other languages feeding in--first Celtic, then Latin, then Danish, then French, then more Latin and some Greek, then Dutch and Italian and Spanish, and finally a large number of smaller tributaries representing many other of the world's nations. The source of the river, of course--the Lake Itasca of English--lies in Northern Teutonic, the north part of Germany and the Scandinavian countries from which the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes emigrated to the British Isles. Such study is not wasteful of time. It adds some words to students' vocabularies, it is a reflection of historical developments, and it shows some of the interchange that has long gone on between speakers of English and speakers of other languages. It is an important contribution to the culture and to the human awareness of our young people.

The history of the English language, in addition to revealing borrowings from abroad, has other cultural and intellectual values. One is that it helps to account for the existence of dialects, about which I talked earlier. Another is that it demonstrates the fact that language is constantly changing. Nothing can be done to halt the forces of change. As long as users of a language exist, it will change, because the users are themselves undergoing

change, having new experiences, developing new ideas, using new tools, finding new means of entertainment. The history of the language also reveals and explains many of the characteristics of the language, such as why so many of our short, everyday words are among the oldest, why most musical terms are Italian, why homonyms exist, how a word has changed its meaning over the years, how fashions in slang change almost as rapidly as fashions in dress, how people and places got their names, or how sentence patterns have evolved through the centuries. This kind of information makes students more aware of what they are doing when they speak or write; it makes them more meticulous in their use of language and more appreciative as consumers of language--for example, as readers of literature.

The New Lexicology

The last feature of English language instruction that I wish to discuss is lexicology. This term was seldom used ten years ago, in 1966. It is used now to refer to all facets of the study of words; semantics, vocabulary development, derivation, application, dictionary making, and stylistic effects dependent on selection of words. Thus it is much broader than lexicography, a term with which it was once confused.

Many children and youth can be fascinated by words. The interesting stories of word origins appeal to them--for example, abundance; unda in that word is Latin for ocean or waves; abundance pertains to plenty, and nothing on earth is more plentiful than the waves of the ocean. The child who adds abundance to his vocabulary, or reinforces its meaning for himself, also adds abundant, abundantly, and possible undulant, undulate, undulation, inundate, and even redundant. In our classes the teachers and students often talk about words. They experiment with them in sentences, noting the effects of using this word or that. They talk about why a professional writer chose this word instead of another. Interest in words is constant, not just something that appears in an isolated unit now and then.

Dictionary-making, or lexicography, is another facet of lexicology. Much of the furor over the Third Edition of

Webster's, in the early sixties, was caused by popular ignorance of lexicography. Our students now learn that dictionaries are intended to describe, not regulate. They learn also how lexicographers work, how they determine a word's meaning, and the other information they present. Students prepare their own definitions; they compile their own dictionaries of teen-age slang or other specialized topics. They thus become knowledgeable about dictionaries and simultaneously increase their knowledge of words.

The study of semantics has been revived in the seventies. It was a popular subject in the late forties and early fifties, and then became much less so. Basically, semantics shows the ways by which language can move men. It distinguishes reportorial language from the language of emotion. It explores connotations and not just denotations. Its study is important for the student as a user language and as a reader of literature. Teachers of the sixties, we now believe, were mistaken to reduce their emphasis on semantics.

The English language program of the seventies differs generally from that of earlier decades in being richer. All through the nineteenth century and the first six decades of the twentieth, with the exception of the classes of a few unusual teachers, the language program was an impoverished one. It consisted mainly of grammar and usage, with only incidental attention to the other aspects. It ignored the richness inherent in the language. It repeated grammatical analysis and usage rules ad nauseam. In many schools the language program used to be essentially a negative one, whose chief purpose was to tell students what they should not do. Our language programs in the seventies, in contrast, are affirmative. They offer students a rich diet of information about dialect, history of the language, lexicology, usage, and grammar, They engage students in constructive tasks, not just the correction of error.

At the beginning I said that English in the seventies is being used increasingly around the world, that it is the major language of international communication. As the several hundred million native speakers of English learn more about it and use it with increasing effectiveness, they serve not only themselves but also the cause of increasing understanding among the peoples of the globe.